arXiv:cond-mat/9702113v1 [cond-mat.dis-nn] 12 Feb 1997

Spectral correlations in the crossover between GUE and Poisson regularity: on the identification of scales

Thomas Guhr and Axel Müller–Groeling
Max–Planck–Institut für Kernphysik, Postfach 103980, D–69029 Heidelberg, Germany

Motivated by questions of present interest in nuclear and condensed matter physics we consider the superposition of a diagonal matrix with independent random entries and a GUE. The relative strength of the two contributions is determined by a parameter λ suitably defined on the unfolded scale. Using results for the spectral two–point correlator of this model obtained in the framework of the supersymmetry method we focus attention on two different regimes. For $\lambda \ll 1$ the correlations are given by Dawson's integral while for $\lambda \gg 1$ we derive a novel analytical formula for the two–point function. In both cases the energy scales, in units of the mean level spacing, at which deviations from pure GUE behavior become noticable can be identified. We also derive an exact expansion of the local level density for finite level number.

PACS numbers: 05.40.+j, 05.45.+b, 72.15.Rn

I. INTRODUCTION

Transitions from regular to chaotic fluctuation properties have been observed, experimentally and theoretically, in many different areas of physics. As examples, we mention topics in atomic (see, e.g. Ref. 1) and nuclear (see, e.g. Refs. 2–4) physics, the relation between level statistics and localization in condensed matter physics, and, of course, quantum chaology. Although the physical mechanisms responsible for this crossover can differ considerably from system to system, its statistical signatures follow a common pattern. This fact calls for a description in terms of Random Matrix Theory[5,6]. Although this transition has already been addressed by numerous authors over the years, there are still many formerly unknown features being found in new areas prompting new interest and research. In particular, there is a constant challenge for theorists to check whether these new aspects are in agreement or in disagreement with the predictions of Random Matrix Theory and, whether or not they can be understood analytically. Because of its statistical foundations, Random Matrix Theory is a very ambitious concept since it aims, very often successfully, at a unifying description of statistical features of very different physical systems.

Recently, such a challenge has been posed by new developments in quantum chaology and condensed matter physics. In studying a random matrix model describing the transition from regular to chaotic behavior which was motivated by a model of rotational damping in nuclear physics[7], Persson and Åberg[8] and Mizutori and Åberg[9] identified, numerically and phenomenologically, a critical length scale L_c (there referred to as $L_{\max}$) in the energy spectrum. Below this scale, the long range correlations are chaotic and above it they become regular. This length scale was related to the spreading width or "energy localization length" of the wave functions. The new findings in condensed matter physics require a more detailed excursion. In the last ten years random matrix theory has found wide applications in the modeling of transport and equilibrium properties of mesoscopic systems. Prominent examples include electron transport in quasi–one dimensional disordered wires[10] and persistent currents in mesoscopic rings[11]. The general assumption in all these approaches was that electron–electron interactions can be neglected. In view of the considerable discrepancy between the relatively small currents calculated for rings with noninteracting electrons[12,11] and the large experimental values[13] it has become generally accepted in the last few years that interactions play a vital role in the persistent current problem. Quite recently, evidence has been put forward that interactions might also change our present understanding of transport and localization in mesoscopic systems considerably: Shepelyansky predicted[14] that two interacting particles in a 1d disordered chain can be extended on a scale L_2 far exceeding the one–particle localization length L_1. Subsequent work[15,16] has quickly led to a definite confirmation and a more detailed understanding of this phenomenon. As far as the two–particle effect in one dimension is concerned, there is probably only one unresolved issue left: the question of the parameter combination that governs the enhancement of L_2 as compared to L_1. Measuring lengths in units of the lattice spacing, and the strength U of the (Hubbard–type) interaction in units of the hopping integral, Shepelyansky found $L_2 \propto U^2 L_1^2$. On the other hand, a microscopic, numerical calculation[17] revealed that $L_2 \propto |U| L_1^2$. In a recent paper[18], an attempt was made to resolve this discrepancy by studying both an effective Hamiltonian for the two–particle problem and a microscopic model. The effective Hamiltonian, which was the basis for Shepelyansky's original claim, is constructed in the following way: Diagonalize the noninteracting part of the two–electron problem and express the microscopic Hamiltonian in the basis of two–electron product states. The resulting representation consists of a diagonal contribution containing the eigenvalues of the noninteracting problem,

and an offdiagonal contribution originating from the interaction operator. With the crucial assumption that both the diagonal and the offdiagonal matrix elements can be chosen to be random variables we arrive at a random matrix model that is precisely of the form to be studied in the present paper. The relative strength between diagonal and offdiagonal matrix elements is determined by the interaction strength U and the one–particle localization length L_1 (i.e., the strength of the disorder). The quantity of interest in this matrix model is the energy scale $E_c^{(2)}$ at which the spectral correlations deviate from pure random matrix behavior. This "spreading width" or "two–particle Thouless energy" was shown by Imry[15], who generalized the famous Thouless scaling picture to two–electron transport, to determine the two–particle localization length via the relation

$$\frac{L_2}{L_1} = g_2(L_1) = \frac{E_c^{(2)}}{\Delta_2} \; . \tag{1.1}$$

Here, g_2 is the "two–particle conductance"[15] and Δ_2 the two–particle level spacing. If one employs Fermi's Golden Rule to estimate $E_c^{(2)}/\Delta_2 \propto U^2 L_1$ (see Ref. 15), Eq. (1.1) immediately leads to Shepelyansky's original relation $L_2 \propto U^2 L_1^2$. The main result of[18] was to point out that Fermi's Golden Rule is inappropriate as long as the off-diagonal matrix elements are sufficiently weak. Instead, it was found numerically that there exists a regime where $E_c^{(2)}/\Delta_2 \propto |U|\sqrt{L_1}$. While this observation does not directly explain the numerical scaling law[17] $L_2 \propto |U| L_1^2$ it hints at a possible origin of the linear dependence on U. In a recent paper[19] Jacquod, Shepelyansky, and Sushkov argue that $E_c^{(2)}/\Delta_2 \propto |U|$ around the middle of the spectrum (i.e. in the vicinity of the band center) while $E_c^{(2)}/\Delta_2 \propto U^2$ otherwise. This offers an alternative explanation for the different numerical findings. The quantity $E_c^{(2)}/\Delta_2$ should of course be identified with the critical length scale L_c in Refs. 8,9.

It is the purpose of the present paper to derive analytical formulas that can serve to study the critical length scales discussed in quantum chaology[8,9] and condensed matter physics[18]. To this end, we make use of an integral representation of the exact two–point correlation function for the effective Hamiltonian recently derived by one of us[20,21]. In taking such an analytical approach we wish to present a unifying discussion which is applicable to the findings in both fields, in quantum chaology and condensed matter physics. Therefore, since we want to make this presentation self-contained and readable for a broader audience, we review and comment on earlier analytical results in Sec. II before we focus on the two different regimes in Sec. III. In Sec. IV, we compute the local level density exactly for finite level number. We summarize and discuss our results in Sec. V.

II. MODEL AND OUTLINE OF METHOD

In Sec. II A, we compare those two random matrix models describing a crossover from Poisson regular to chaotic fluctuations which are currently being used in the framework set in the introduction. We discuss earlier results for the joint probability density and the correlations in Sec. II B. In Sec. II C, we briefly review the analytical solution derived in Refs. 20,21.

A. Two Models - Same Physics

The Hamilton matrix of our physical problem is represented by an $N \times N$ matrix H with random entries. To achieve meaningful statistical results, we have to average of the ensemble of all those random matrices which satisfy the physically relevant boundary conditions. Thus, the physics of such an statistical model is uniquely determined by choosing the probability density function of the matrices H. Here, we are interested in a crossover or transition between different regimes implying that we have to go beyond the commonly used Gaussian Ensembles[5] which describe fully chaotic systems. We will mainly study systems under broken time-reversal invariance since, first, some presently investigated systems, e.g. mesoscopic rings in a magnetic field[18], belong to this class and, second, recent results[20,21] make a detailed analytical discussion of this situation possible. For our random matrix model this means that we have to work with Hermitean matrices whose distribution reaches the limit of the Gaussian Unitary Ensemble[5] for some value of the crossover or transition parameter. There are two models which are currently being used in this context.

Weinmann and Pichard[18] studied numerically the two-level correlations induced by the probability density function

$$P^{(A)}(H,\mu) = \prod_{n=1}^{N} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \exp\left(-H_{nn}^2\right) \prod_{n<m} \sqrt{\frac{1+\mu}{\pi}} \exp\left(-(1+\mu)\mathrm{Re}^2 H_{nm}\right)$$

$$\prod_{n<m} \sqrt{\frac{1+\mu}{\pi}} \exp\left(-(1+\mu)\mathrm{Im}^2 H_{nm}\right) \tag{2.1}$$

where we used our freedom to fix the energy scale by choosing a value of $1/2$ as the variance of the Gaussian distributions for the diagonal elements. The parameter μ alters the variance of the distribution for the off-diagonal matrix elements in such a way that this ensemble interpolates between a pure Gaussian Unitary Ensemble (GUE) for $\mu = 0$ and a Poisson Ensemble for $\mu \to \infty$. In the latter case, all off-diagonal matrix elements are weighted by δ-functions. The parameters of this model are related to those of the physical problem of two interacting particles as follows[18]. The matrix dimension N is given by $L_1^d(L_1^d+1)/2$, the number of symmetrized two–particle states in a d–dimensional system of size L_1. The variance σ^2 of the diagonal elements is defined by the bandwidth B of the noninteracting problem, $\sigma^2 \approx B^2/3$. Normalizing this variance to $1/2$ as we have done above amounts to measuring all energies in units of $\sqrt{2/3}B$. In these units the variance of the off-diagonal elements is given by $(1+\mu)^{-1} = 6(U/B)^2 L_1^{-3d}$.

We introduce a new parameter $\nu = 1/\sqrt{1+\mu}$ and write the probability density function (2.1) in a more convenient form,

$$\begin{aligned} P^{(A)}(H,\nu) &= P^{(1)}(H,\nu) \prod_{n=1}^{N} p^{(d)}(H_{nn},\nu) \\ P^{(1)}(H,\nu) &= \frac{2^{N(N-1)/2}}{(\pi\nu^2)^{N^2/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\nu^2}\mathrm{tr}H^2\right) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

The distribution $P^{(1)}(H,\nu)$ is a normalized Gaussian distribution with variance $\nu^2/2$. The normalized distributions $p^{(d)}(H_{nn},\nu)$ affect only the diagonal elements. The definition (2.2) includes (2.1), but is slightly more general since we do not specify the function $p^{(d)}(z,\nu)$ explicitly. The Poisson case is now recovered in the limit $\nu \to 0$ whereas large values of ν yield the GUE. In the sequel, we will refer to the class of models defined by Eq. (2.2) as to model A. The k-point correlation functions depending on k energies $x_p,\ p = 1,\ldots,k$ in this model are given by

$$R_k^{(A)}(x_1,\ldots,x_k,\nu) = \frac{1}{\pi^k} \int d[H]\, P^{(A)}(H,\nu) \prod_{p=1}^{k} \mathrm{Im}\,\mathrm{tr}\frac{1}{x_p^- - H} \tag{2.3}$$

where the energies are given imaginary increments such that $x_p^- = x_p - i\varepsilon$. The volume element $d[H]$ is, as usual, the product of all independent variables.

The second model, which we will refer to as model B, is defined through the random Hamiltonian

$$H(\alpha) \ = \ H^{(0)} \ + \ \alpha H^{(1)} \tag{2.4}$$

consisting of a regular and a chaotic part, $H^{(0)}$ and $H^{(1)}$, respectively, with an interpolating transition parameter α. The matrices $H^{(1)}$ belong to the GUE, i.e. the probability density function is given by $P^{(1)}(H,1)$ as defined in Eq. (2.2). The probability density function $P^{(0)}(H^{(0)})$ is completely arbitrary. The calculation of the correlation functions in this model,

$$R_k^{(B)}(x_1,\ldots,x_k,\alpha) \ = \ \frac{1}{\pi^k} \int d[H^{(0)}]\, P^{(0)}(H^{(0)}) \int d[H^{(1)}]\, P^{(1)}(H^{(1)},1) \prod_{p=1}^{k} \mathrm{Im}\,\mathrm{tr}\frac{1}{x_p^{\pm} - H(\alpha)} \tag{2.5}$$

requires an average over both matrices. However, due to the rotational invariance of the volume elements, the unitary matrices diagonalizing $H^{(0)}$ can be absorbed implying that, without loss of generality, $H^{(0)}$ can be chosen to be diagonal. Since we want to have Poisson statistics as a limiting case, we can write

$$P^{(0)}(H^{(0)}) \ = \ \prod_{n=1}^{N} p^{(0)}(H_{nn}^{(0)}) \prod_{n>m} \delta(\mathrm{Re}H_{nm}^{(0)})\delta(\mathrm{Im}H_{nm}^{(0)}) \tag{2.6}$$

where the function $p^{(0)}(z)$ is smooth but otherwise arbitrary. We recover the Poisson and the GUE limits for zero and infinite transition parameter, respectively. Model B has been studied by many authors, for a review see Refs. 20–25.

Although it is intuitively obvious that Models A and B must be closely related, we feel it is worthwhile to work out the precise relationship between them. Consider model B. The form (2.5) of the correlation functions suggests to use the matrices $H = H(\alpha)$ introduced in Eq. (2.4) as new integration variables, we find

$$R_k^{(B)}(x_1,\ldots,x_k,\alpha) \;=\; \frac{1}{\pi^k}\int d[H^{(0)}]\,P^{(0)}(H^{(0)})\int d[H]\,P^{(1)}(H-H^{(0)},\alpha)\,\prod_{p=1}^{k}\mathrm{Im}\,\mathrm{tr}\frac{1}{x_p^{\pm}-H}\;. \tag{2.7}$$

Since the probability density $P^{(1)}$ is Gaussian, the diagonal and off-diagonal elements are, as far as the integration over $H^{(0)}$ is concerned, fully decoupled. In other words, the integration over the purely diagonal matrix $H^{(0)}$ amounts to nothing but a convolution of each of the functions $p^{(0)}(H_{nn}^{(0)})$ with a Gaussian $g(H_{nn}-H_{nn}^{(0)},\alpha)$ which gives a new probability density function

$$P^{(c)}(H,\alpha)=\prod_{n=1}^{N}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}p^{(0)}(H_{nn}^{(0)})g(H_{nn}-H_{nn}^{(0)},\alpha)dH_{nn}^{(0)} \tag{2.8}$$

for the matrix elements on the diagonal. Due to the fact that the total probability density function is a product of $P^{(c)}(H,\alpha)$ and the remaining Gaussians $g(\mathrm{Re}H_{nm},\alpha)$ and $g(\mathrm{Im}H_{nm},\alpha)$ for the off-diagonal matrix elements, it is obviously of the form (2.1) or, equivalently, (2.2). Hence, we have convinced ourselves that, after a proper re-definition of the transition parameters, model A and model B describe the same physical situation. We may therefore confine our discussion to model B whose analytical properties are, advantageously, already studied in great detail. Thus, from now on, we drop the upper index (B). Note that these considerations can easily be generalized to the cases of real symmetric or quaternion self adjoint matrices.

Finally, we would like to emphasize that there are more models which describe a transition from Poisson to GUE statistics. We mention two recent works, a new formal model by Moshe et al.[26] and a study in the context of disordered systems by Altland and Fuchs[27]. The fact that the two limiting cases, the Poisson and the GUE statistics, are the same in all these models does not imply that the interpolation between these limits is necessarily the same. The concrete physical situation dictates which model to choose.

B. On the Computation of the Correlation Functions

A quantity of central interest in every random matrix model is the joint probability density function $P_E(X,\alpha)$ of the eigenvalues. In the case of Hermitean matrices, this function can be worked out explicitly for our model B. We diagonalize the matrix H by a unitary matrix U such that $H=U^{\dagger}XU$ where $X=\mathrm{diag}(x_1,\ldots,x_N)$ is the diagonal matrix of the eigenvalues. To express the probability density as a function of the latter alone, we have to do the integrals over $H^{(0)}$ and over U,

$$P_E(X,\alpha)d[X]=\int d[H^{(0)}]P^{(0)}(H^{(0)})\int_{U(N)}P^{(1)}(H-H^{(0)},\alpha)d[H]\;. \tag{2.9}$$

The off-diagonal elements of $H^{(0)}$ are integrated out trivially leaving us with the diagonal part which we denote by $X^{(0)}$. As is well known, the volume element of H is given by $d[H]=\Delta_N^2(X)d[X]d\mu(U)$ where $\Delta_N(X)=\prod_{n<m}(x_n-x_m)$ is the Vandermonde determinant. Since the function $P^{(1)}$ is Gaussian, the integral over the unitary group with Haar measure $d\mu(U)$ is just the Harish-Chandra Itzykson Zuber integral[28] which has been used already in Refs. 24,29 to compute joint probability density functions of the eigenvalues. We arrive at

$$P_E(X,\alpha)=\frac{1}{N!}\int d[X^{(0)}]P^{(0)}(X^{(0)})\det[g(x_n-x_m^{(0)},\alpha)]_{n,m=1,\ldots,N}\frac{\Delta_N(X)}{\Delta_N(X^{(0)})} \tag{2.10}$$

where $g(z,\alpha)$ is the normalized Gaussian with variance $\alpha^2/2$ which was introduced above. Note that, due to the symmetries of the integrand, this can be written more conveniently as

$$P_E(X,\alpha)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi\alpha^2}^N}\int d[X^{(0)}]P^{(0)}(X^{(0)})\exp\left(-\frac{1}{\alpha^2}\mathrm{tr}(X-X^{(0)})^2\right)\frac{\Delta_N(X)}{\Delta_N(X^{(0)})}\;. \tag{2.11}$$

The Gaussians yield δ-functions for vanishing variance which implies that the Poisson case is recovered in the limit $\alpha\to 0$. For very large transition parameter $\alpha\to\infty$, the GUE joint probability density function has to re-emerge. This limit is non-trivial but can be checked using the methods developed in Ref. 24.

The k-level correlation function is given as the $N-k$ dimensional integral

$$R_k(x_1,\ldots,x_k,\alpha) \;=\; \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}dx_{k+1}\cdots\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}dx_N\,P_E(X,\alpha) \tag{2.12}$$

allowing one to use the formula (2.11) to compute them. This approach was taken by Lenz[24] who managed to express the most interesting two-level correlations $R_2(x_1, x_2, \alpha)$ as a four dimensional integral. His calculation is exact for every α and every N. Unfortunately, the integrand involves ratios of N-dependent determinants which rendered the evaluation of the physically interesting limit of infinitely many levels impossible. Another approach was recently put forward by Pandey[25] who chooses Dyson's Brownian motion model as a starting point. He arrives at a two dimensional integral representation for the two-level correlation function on the unfolded energy scale, i.e. in the limit $N \to \infty$. Although his derivation is only sketchy, we have no doubts that his result is correct. Apparently, he avoids the explicit use of the Harish-Chandra Itzykson Zuber integral by conducting a highly non-trivial re-summation of certain representation functions of $U(N)$. Yet another technique, the graded eigenvalue method, was used by one of the present authors in Refs. 20,21. It is a variant of Efetov's famous supersymmetry method[30] which relies on the observation that averages over a random potential can be most efficiently done by mapping the original field theory onto superspace. In Ref. 31 it was shown that averages over random matrix ensembles lead to the same model in superspace. Thus, supersymmetry can be viewed as something like the "irreducible representation" of Random Matrix Theory. The graded eigenvalue method allows therefore for a much faster derivation of spectral correlation functions, even for finite level number, than any other method we are aware of. Moreover, its results go beyond those of Refs. 24,25. First, higher correlations can be studied, the graded eigenvalue method yields a $2k$ dimensional integral representation for the k-level correlation functions. Second, these integrals have a very convenient and rather compact form even for finite level number N. Third, the unfolding, i.e. the limit $N \to \infty$ is trivial and, fourth, the two-level correlations on the unfolded scale become a double integral for completely arbitrary initial probability density functions $P^{(0)}(H^{(0)})$.

C. Supersymmetry Method

In order to make our presentation self-contained for those readers who are familiar with the main concepts of the supersymmetry method, we will briefly sketch the crucial steps that were taken in Refs. 20,21. Readers with little background in supersymmetry are referred to Refs. 30,31, or, especially regarding the graded eigenvalue method, to Ref. 32. By including the real parts of the traces of the Green functions in Eq. (2.5), we define the functions $\widehat{R}_k(x_1, \ldots, x_k, \alpha)$ which always allow the reconstruction of the physically interesting functions $R_k(x_1, \ldots, x_k, \alpha)$ as linear combinations of the functions $\widehat{R}_k(x_1, \ldots, x_k, \alpha)$. Advantageously, those can be written as the derivatives

$$\widehat{R}_k(x_1, \ldots, x_k, \alpha) \;=\; \frac{1}{(2\pi)^k} \frac{\partial^k}{\prod_{p=1}^k \partial J_p} Z_k(x + J, \alpha) \Bigg|_{J=0} \tag{2.13}$$

of a normalized generating function $Z_k(x + J, \alpha)$. The energies and the source variables are ordered in the diagonal matrices $x = \mathrm{diag}(x_1, x_1, \ldots, x_k, x_k)$ and $J = \mathrm{diag}(-J_1, +J_1, \ldots, -J_k, +J_k)$, respectively. The physically relevant correlations $R_k(x_1, \ldots, x_k, \alpha)$ are generated by the function $\Im Z_k(x + J, \alpha)$ where the symbol $\Im$ stands for the proper linear combination. By using the supersymmetry method, the average over the GUE can be performed directly and the generating function acquires the form

$$\begin{aligned} Z_k(x + J, \alpha) = \int d[H^{(0)}]\, P_N^{(0)}(H^{(0)}) \int d[\sigma]\, Q_k(\sigma, \alpha) \\ \mathrm{detg}^{-1}\left((x^{\pm} + J - \sigma) \otimes 1_N - 1_{2k} \otimes H^{(0)}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

where σ is a $2k \times 2k$ Hermitean supermatrix and 1_N and 1_{2k} are the $N \times N$ and the $2k \times 2k$ unit matrices. The function

$$Q_k(\sigma, \alpha) \;=\; 2^{k(k-1)} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\alpha^2} \mathrm{trg}\sigma^2\right) \tag{2.15}$$

can be viewed as a normalized probability density function for the supermatrices. It is useful to shift the matrix $x + J$ into this Gaussian function and then to diagonalize the supermatrix, $\sigma = u^{-1} s u$ by a superunitary matrix u where the k eigenvalues $s_{p1},\ p = 1, \ldots, k$ in the boson boson and the k eigenvalues $is_{p2},\ p = 1, \ldots, k$ in the fermion fermion sector are ordered in the matrix $s = \mathrm{diag}(s_{11}, is_{12}, \ldots, s_{k1}, is_{k2})$. The volume elements reads $d[\sigma] = B_k^2(s) d[s] d\mu(u)$[32] where $d[s]$ is the product of the eigenvalue differentials and $d\mu(u)$ is the invariant Haar measure of the unitary supergroup. The square root of the Jacobian, here referred to as Berezinian, is given by the determinant $B_k(s) = \det\left[1/(s_{p1} - is_{q2})\right]_{p,q=1,\ldots,k}$. In these coordinates, the generating function for the entire transition can be written as

$$Z_k(x+J,\alpha) \;=\; \int Q_k(u^{-1}su-x-J,\alpha)\, Z_k^{(0)}(s)\, B_k(s) d[s] d\mu(u) \tag{2.16}$$

where the function

$$Z_k^{(0)}(x+J) \;=\; \int d[H^{(0)}]\, P_N^{(0)}(H^{(0)})\, \mathrm{detg}^{-1}\left((x^{\pm}+J)\otimes 1_N - 1_{2k}\otimes H^{(0)}\right) \tag{2.17}$$

is the generating function of the correlations of the arbitrary ensemble defined through $P^{(0)}(H^{(0)})$. Obviously, the required average over the unitary supergroup u in Eq. (2.16) is just the supersymmetric version of the Harish-Chandra Itzykson Zuber integral. This observation is the main ingredient of the graded eigenvalue method. Collecting everything, and performing the derivatives with respect to the source variables as in Ref. 32, we find

$$R_k(x_1,\ldots,x_k,\alpha) \;=\; \frac{(-1)^k}{\pi^k} \int G_k(s-x,\alpha)\, \Im Z_k^{(0)}(s)\, B_k(s) d[s] \tag{2.18}$$

for non-zero α. The case $\alpha = 0$ is trivial by construction. Here, the kernel is given by the Gaussian

$$G_k(s-r,\alpha) \;=\; \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi\alpha^2}^{2k}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\alpha^2}\mathrm{trg}(s-r)^2\right) \;. \tag{2.19}$$

In order to calculate the generic fluctuations, we have to unfold the correlation functions for large level number N by removing the dependence on the level density. We define new energies $\xi_p = x_p/D,\ p = 1,\ldots,k$ where the mean level spacing D is of the order $1/\sqrt{N}$. The transition parameter α is defined on the original energy scale and has therefore to be unfolded, too. The new, universal transition parameter $\lambda = \alpha/D$ was first introduced by Pandey[33]. The k-level correlation functions on the unfolded scale $X_k(\xi_1,\ldots,\xi_k,\lambda) = \lim_{N\to\infty} D^k R_k(x_1,\ldots,x_k,\alpha)$ are then generic, i.e. translation invariant over the spectrum. It is useful to unfold the integration variables s in Eq. (2.18) by making the rescaling $s \to s/D$. We arrive at

$$X_k(\xi_1,\ldots,\xi_k,\lambda) \;=\; \frac{(-1)^k}{\pi^k} \int G_k(s-\xi,\lambda)\, \Im z_k^{(0)}(s)\, B_k(s) d[s] \tag{2.20}$$

for non-zero λ where the unfolded generating function of the arbitrary correlations is given by $z_k^{(0)}(s) = \lim_{N\to\infty} Z_k^{(0)}(Ds)$. Hence, we have expressed the unfolded k-level correlation function for the transition from arbitrary to GUE fluctuations as a $2k$-fold integral. Note that the limit of infinitely many levels is trivial due to the application of supersymmetry. The Gaussian kernel remains unchanged when going from the original to the unfolded energy scale. It was shown in Ref. 21 that the generating function obeys an exact diffusion equation which is, remarkably, the same on both energy scales, the Gaussian kernel is the Green function of this diffusion.

Here, we are mainly interested in the two-level correlations. Due to translation invariance[5] on the unfolded scale, they depend only on the difference $r = \xi_1 - \xi_2$ of the energies. Therefore, it turns out to be useful to make the change $s_1 = s_{11} + s_{21},\ t_1 = s_{11} - s_{21},\ s_2 = s_{12} + s_{22}$ and $t_2 = s_{12} - s_{22}$ of the integration variables. Since $\Im z_2^{(0)}(s)$ depends only on the differences of the eigenvalues by construction, it cannot depend on $s_1 + is_2$. Thus, we write $\Im z_2^{(0)}(s) = \Im z_2^{(0)}(s_1 - is_2, t_1, t_2)$ which, for reasons of consistency, should be even in each of the differences t_1 and t_2. By using a standard integral theorem of complex analysis, the integrals over s_1 and s_2 can be performed straightforwardly and the two-level correlations can thus be cast into the form

$$X_2(r,\lambda) \;=\; \frac{8}{\pi^3\lambda^2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2\lambda^2}(t_1^2+t_2^2)\right) \sinh\frac{rt_1}{\lambda^2} \sin\frac{rt_2}{\lambda^2} \frac{t_1 t_2}{(t_1^2+t_2^2)^2}\, \Im z_2^{(0)}(0,t_1,t_2)\, dt_1 dt_2 \tag{2.21}$$

which is exact for every non-zero value of the transition parameter λ.

We emphasize that all results derived so far are correct for arbitrary initial correlations $R_k^{(0)}(x_1,\ldots,x_k)$ or $X_k^{(0)}(\xi_1,\ldots,\xi_k)$. We now apply them to the case of the Poisson, i.e. correlation-free initial spectrum, whose probability density function is given in Eq. (2.6). A straightforward calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned} Z_k^{(0)}(s) &= \left(1 \;+\; \frac{\pi}{N}\sum_{p=1}^{k} b_p(s)\widehat{R}_1^{(0)}(s_{p1})\right)^N \\ b_p(s) &= (is_{p2} - s_{p1}) \prod_{q\neq p} \frac{is_{q2} - s_{p1}}{s_{q1}^{\pm} - s_{p1}^{\pm}} \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

where $\widehat{R}_1^{(0)}(x)$ is the Stiltjes transform of $R_1^{(0)}(x)$. We point out that this is exact for all values of N. By choosing $\widehat{R}_1^{(0)}(x) = \widehat{R}_1^{(1)}(x)$ to evaluate the limit $N \to \infty$, we find

$$z_k^{(0)}(s) \;=\; \prod_{p=1}^{k} \exp\left(\mp i\pi b_p(s)\right) \;. \tag{2.23}$$

The signs are determined by the choice of the sign of the imaginary increment in the Green function. In the coordinates introduced above, the initial condition for the two-level correlations (2.21) takes the form

$$\Im z_2^{(0)}(0,t_1,t_2) \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Re}\left(\exp\left(-i\pi\frac{t_1^2+t_2^2}{2t_1^-}\right)-1\right) \tag{2.24}$$

which still involves an imaginary increment. In Refs. 20,21, Eqs. (2.21) and (2.24) were used to construct a two dimensional integral representation for $X_2(r,\lambda)$ in terms of Bessel functions. However, for the discussion to be performed in the next section, the form (2.24) is the more convenient one.

III. TWO DIFFERENT REGIMES

Both the numerical findings[18] described in the introduction and the structure of the integral representation (2.21) suggest to distinguish between the two cases $\lambda \ll 1$ and $\lambda \gg 1$. In these limits the exact but very cumbersome expression (2.21) can be substantially simplified. After introducing the proper observable in Sec. III A, we deal with the small λ and large λ regimes in Secs. III B and III C, respectively.

A. Spectral long range correlations

The spectral long range correlations are particularly well suited for the study of fluctuation properties in systems which undergo transitions. The level number variance $\Sigma^2(L)$ and the spectral rigidity $\Delta_3(L)$ describe[34], as functions of the interval length L on the unfolded scale, the fluctuations of the integrated, unfolded level density around its smooth value which is just L. Poisson regularity results, for both observables, in a linear behavior whereas chaotic correlations yield a logarithmic dependence on L. It is intuitively clear and was shown in the numerical simulations[3,8,9,18] that the admixture of chaotic features becomes first visible on shorter scales in the spectrum. In other words, the larger L, the stronger have the chaotic features to be in order to bring the long range correlations close to the logarithmic behavior. Thus there is a critical interval length, near which $\Sigma^2(L)$ or $\Delta_3(L)$ "bend away" from the chaotic behavior to show a linear characteristic typical for the lack of correlations in the Poisson case. This critical length $L_{\max}$ or L_c, respectively, was introduced and studied in Refs. 8,9,18 and is also the quantity of interest in our discussion. In Ref. 8, the critical length $L_{\max}$ was interpreted as the typical spreading width of the wave functions on the unfolded energy scale. In the context of condensed matter physics[18], the critical length L_c was identified as the Thouless energy in units of the mean level spacing. Obviously, these two viewpoints describe closely related physical situations which are formulated in a unifying language in the random matrix model.

We now wish to acquire information about the dependence of the critical length on the transition parameter λ from the analytical discussion of the previous section. As is well known[34], the level number variance is related to the two-level correlations by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^2(L,\lambda) &= L - 2\int_0^L (L-r)Y_2(r,\lambda)dr \\ X_2(r,\lambda) &= 1 - Y_2(r,\lambda) \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where $Y_2(r,\lambda)$ is referred to as the two-level cluster function. The "bending away" from the logarithmic behavior is accompanied by a change of the curvature of $\Sigma^2(L,\lambda)$. Therefore, we may identify the point at which the curvature changes with the critical length. Thus, we simply have to investigate the second order derivative,

$$\frac{d^2}{dL^2}\Sigma^2(L,\lambda) = -2\,Y_2(L,\lambda) \;, \tag{3.2}$$

which is, by construction, just the two-level cluster function. Therefore we can alternatively determine the zeros of $Y_2(L,\lambda)$ or directly investigate the function $\Sigma^2(L,\lambda)$ in order to identify the scale L_c.

B. Small λ

The small λ regime can be studied by perturbation theory. This approach has already been taken in Refs. 22,23 with the result

$$\begin{aligned} X_2(r,\lambda) &\simeq \frac{r}{\lambda}\,\exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{2\lambda^2}\right)\int_0^{r/\lambda}\exp\left(\frac{\eta^2}{2}\right)d\eta \\ &= \frac{r}{\lambda}\int_0^{\infty}\exp\left(-\frac{\eta^2}{2}\right)\sin\frac{r\eta}{\lambda}d\eta \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

which is a universal function of r/λ. It was checked in Ref. 21 that the analytical expressions (2.21) and (2.24) indeed yield the approximation (3.3) for small λ. Since $Y_2(r,\lambda)$ is the deviation from the Poisson behavior which is just unity, we only have to find the zero of this function in the variable r/λ. We find $r/\lambda \approx 1.3$ implying that the critical length behaves as

$$L_c \approx 1.3\,\lambda \tag{3.4}$$

for small values of λ. Thus, the critical length is indeed linear in λ for small values of the transition parameter in agreement with the numerical investigations in Ref. 18.

C. Large λ

To study the large λ regime we evaluate the asymptotic expansion of $X_2(r,\lambda)$ to first order in the inverse transition parameter by a saddle point approximation. To bring Eqs. (2.21) and (2.24) into a form which is manifestly suitable for such a procedure we substitute according to $t_1 = \lambda^2 t_1'$ and $t_2 = \lambda^2 t_2'$. Omitting the primes we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} X_2(r,\lambda) = \frac{8}{\pi^3\lambda^2}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt_1 dt_2\,\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{2}(t_1^2+t_2^2)\right)\sinh rt_1\sin rt_2 \\ \frac{t_1 t_2}{(t_1^2+t_2^2)^2}\Im z_2^{(0)}(0,\lambda^2 t_1,\lambda^2 t_2) \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

with the initial condition given by Eq. (2.24). A direct saddle point approximation still meets with the problem that there are solutions of the saddle point equations for which $t_1^2 + t_2^2 = 0$. To avoid the ensuing singularity in (3.5) we introduce an additional parameter β and a function

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_2(r,\lambda,\beta) = \frac{8}{\pi^3\lambda^2}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt_1 dt_2\,\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{2}\beta(t_1^2+t_2^2)\right)\sinh rt_1\sin rt_2 \\ t_1 t_2\,\Im z_2^{(0)}(0,\lambda^2 t_1,\lambda^2 t_2)\;, \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

in terms of which we have

$$X_2(r,\lambda) = \frac{\lambda^4}{4}\lim_{\eta\to\infty}\int_1^{\eta} d\beta'\int_{\beta'}^{\eta} d\beta\,\tilde{X}_2(r,\lambda,\beta)\;. \tag{3.7}$$

In the integrand of Eq. (3.6), the product $\sinh rt_1 \sin rt_2$ can be replaced by the expression $-i\exp(-rt_1)\exp(-irt_2)$ because the additional contributions vanish upon integration (they make the integrand odd in either t_1 or t_2 or both). We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_2(r,\lambda,\beta) = \frac{2}{\pi^3\lambda^2}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt_1 dt_2\,\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{2}\beta(t_1^2+t_2^2) - rt_1 - irt_2\right) \\ t_1 t_2\left(\exp\left(-i\pi\lambda^2\frac{t_1^2+t_2^2}{2t_1^-}\right) - 1 + c.c.\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

The contributions originating from the exponential and the constant in the square brackets, respectively, have to be treated separately. We begin with the more complicated term, namely

$$\tilde{X}_2^{(a)}(r,\lambda,\beta) = \frac{2}{\pi^3\lambda^2}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt_1 dt_2\, \exp\left(-\mathcal{L}(t_1,t_2)\right)\, t_1 t_2\ ,$$
$$\mathcal{L}(t_1,t_2) = \frac{\lambda^2}{2}\beta(t_1^2+t_2^2) + i\pi\lambda^2\frac{t_1^2+t_2^2}{2t_1^-} + rt_1 + irt_2\ . \tag{3.9}$$

To determine the saddle points we can neglect the imaginary increment for t_1 in the second term of $\mathcal{L}(t_1,t_2)$. The saddle point equations $\partial_{t_1}\mathcal{L}=0$ and $\partial_{t_2}\mathcal{L}=0$ read

$$\lambda^2\beta t_1 + i\pi\frac{\lambda^2}{2}\left(1-\frac{t_2^2}{t_1^2}\right) + r = 0$$
$$\lambda^2\beta t_2 + i\pi\lambda^2\frac{t_2}{t_1} + ir = 0\ . \tag{3.10}$$

With the abbreviations

$$\gamma = i\pi\lambda^2 \qquad \text{and} \qquad t = \lambda^2\beta t_2 + ir \tag{3.11}$$

these equations can be cast into the form

$$t_1 = -\frac{\gamma t_2}{t}\ ,$$
$$t^3 + (\gamma^2 - 2r\gamma)t - 2ir\gamma^2 = 0\ . \tag{3.12}$$

The roots of the cubic equation are given by

$$t^{(1)} = -i\gamma$$
$$t^{(2)} = i\frac{\gamma}{2}\left(1+\sqrt{1-8r/\gamma}\right)\ ,$$
$$t^{(3)} = i\frac{\gamma}{2}\left(1-\sqrt{1-8r/\gamma}\right)\ , \tag{3.13}$$

in terms of which the solutions $t_{1,2}^{(i)}$ $(i=1,2,3)$ for the original variables are easily recovered.

Our saddle point approximation proceeds according to the following scheme,

$$\tilde{X}_2^{(a)}(r,\lambda,\beta) \approx \frac{2}{\pi^3\lambda^2 i}\sum_j t_1^{(j)}t_2^{(j)}\exp\left(-\mathcal{L}(t_1^{(j)},t_2^{(j)})\right)\frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{\det A^{(j)}}}\ , \tag{3.14}$$

where

$$A^{(j)} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial^2\mathcal{L}}{\partial t_1^2}(t_1^{(j)},t_2^{(j)}) & \frac{\partial^2\mathcal{L}}{\partial t_1\partial t_2}(t_1^{(j)},t_2^{(j)}) \\ \frac{\partial^2\mathcal{L}}{\partial t_2\partial t_1}(t_1^{(j)},t_2^{(j)}) & \frac{\partial^2\mathcal{L}}{\partial t_2^2}(t_1^{(j)},t_2^{(j)}) \end{bmatrix} \tag{3.15}$$

is the matrix defining the form of the Gaussian fluctuations around the saddle point. The approximation (3.14) is valid for $\lambda \gg 1$ and all r. Expressing the exponent, the pre-exponential terms, and $\det A$ in (3.14) in terms of the saddle point values (3.13) we get for $j=1,2,3$

$$\mathcal{L}(t_1^{(j)},t_2^{(j)}) = -\frac{r}{2\lambda^2\beta(t^{(j)})^2}(\gamma - it^{(j)})^2(r+it^{(j)})\ ,$$
$$t_1^{(j)}t_2^{(j)} = -\frac{\gamma t^{(j)}}{\lambda^4\beta^2}\left(1-i\frac{r}{t^{(j)}}\right)^2\ ,$$
$$\det A^{(j)} = (\lambda^2\beta)^2\left(1-\frac{t^{(j)}}{t^{(j)}-ir}\left(1+\frac{(t^{(j)})^2}{\gamma^2}\right)\right)\ . \tag{3.16}$$

At this point we notice that $t^{(3)}$ is not a valid saddle point. This can be most easily seen in the extreme GUE limit ($\lambda\to\infty$, $|\gamma|\to\infty$), where $t^{(3)}\to 2ir$. Obviously, $\det A^{(3)} < 0$ in this case, i.e. the matrix $A^{(3)}$ is not positive definite. Therefore, $t^{(3)}$ does not correspond to a maximum of the integrand and will be discarded henceforth.

Before we proceed we have to investigate the second contribution in (3.8),

$$\tilde{X}_2^{(b)}(r,\lambda,\beta) = -\frac{2}{\pi^3\lambda^2}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt_1 dt_2 \, \exp\left(-\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(t_1,t_2)\right) \, t_1 t_2 \ ,$$
$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(t_1,t_2) = \frac{\lambda^2}{2}\beta(t_1^2+t_2^2) + rt_1 + irt_2 \ . \tag{3.17}$$

Here, the saddle point equations are trivial and have the single solution

$$\tilde{t}_1 = -\frac{r}{\lambda^2\beta} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tilde{t}_2 = -\frac{ir}{\lambda^2\beta} \ . \tag{3.18}$$

Therefore, we get in analogy to (3.16)

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tilde{t}_1,\tilde{t}_2) = 0 \ ,$$
$$\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_2 = \frac{ir^2}{(\lambda^2\beta)^2} \ ,$$
$$\det A = (\lambda^2\beta)^2 \ . \tag{3.19}$$

Finally, collecting our results from (3.13), (3.16), and (3.19) and introducing a new parameter through

$$\frac{r}{\gamma} = -i\frac{r}{\pi\lambda^2} = -i\kappa \ , \tag{3.20}$$

we arrive after some algebra at

$$\tilde{X}(r,\lambda,\beta) = \tilde{X}^{(a)}(r,\lambda,\beta) + \tilde{X}^{(b)}(r,\lambda,\beta)$$
$$= \frac{4}{\lambda^4\beta^3}\left(1 - \frac{(2i\kappa+1+\rho)(3+\rho)}{8\sqrt{\rho}}\exp\left(\frac{i\pi r}{4\beta}\frac{(2i\kappa+1+\rho)(3+\rho)^2}{(1+\rho)^2}\right) + \text{c.c.}\right) \tag{3.21}$$

with

$$\rho = \sqrt{1+8i\kappa} \ . \tag{3.22}$$

The integration over the auxiliary parameter β (see (3.7)) is straightforward and leads to the final result of this section,

$$X_2(r,\lambda) = 1 + \left(\frac{2}{(\pi r)^2}\frac{(1+\rho)^4}{(2i\kappa+1+\rho)(3+\rho)^3\sqrt{\rho}}\right.$$
$$\left(\exp\left(i\pi r\frac{(2i\kappa+1+\rho)(3+\rho)^2}{4(1+\rho)^2}\right)\right.$$
$$\left.\left.-i\pi r\frac{(2i\kappa+1+\rho)(3+\rho)^2}{4(1+\rho)^2} - 1\right) + \text{c.c.}\right) \ . \tag{3.23}$$

Although the decisive parameter governing the deviation from the GUE limit is $\kappa = r/\pi\lambda^2$, closer inspection reveals that the critical length L_c is still proportional to λ. We thank Y. Fyodorov for this insight[35]. In a first order expansion in $\kappa \ll 1$, one finds

$$X_2(r,\lambda) \approx 1 + \frac{1}{2(\pi r)^2}\left(e^{-2\pi r\kappa}\cos 2\pi r + 2\pi r\kappa - 1\right) \ . \tag{3.24}$$

For $\kappa \to 0$ this reduces to the GUE limit

$$X_2(r,\lambda\to\infty) = 1 - \left(\frac{\sin\pi r}{\pi r}\right)^2 \ . \tag{3.25}$$

For finite but small κ, Eq. (3.24) shows that the oscillations in $X_2(r,\lambda)$ are exponentially damped on the scale $\kappa r \propto r^2/\lambda^2$ so that L_c must behave like λ. Numerical evaluations[36] of formula (3.23), which did not rely on the assumption $\kappa \ll 1$, confirmed this view. At this point, an important caveat is in order. In Random Matrix Theory,

the unfolding procedure usually involves the crucial assumption that the transition parameter α scales like the mean level spacing as the level number N increases. This is formally necessary to keep the ratio $\lambda = \alpha/D$, i.e. the transition parameter on the unfolded energy scale, fixed when the limit $N \to \infty$ is taken. Physically, this is a well justified assumption which means that the chaotic admixture, although affecting the fluctuation properties considerably, does not change the mean level spacing. The results of Refs. 20,21 which are the starting point of our present considerations were derived under this assumption. It is not completely straightforward to relate our parameter λ to the transition parameters of the recent studies in Refs. 18,19. Further research along these lines is under way[36].

It is interesting to note[35] that under the assumption $r \ll \lambda \ll \lambda^2$ Eq. (3.24) can be further simplified to give

$$X_2(r, \lambda \gg r) = 1 - \left(\frac{\sin \pi r}{\pi r}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{\pi^2 \lambda^2} \sin^2 \pi r \ . \tag{3.26}$$

Remarkably, this expression coincides exactly with a result derived by Kravtsov and Mirlin[37] for the spectral two–point function of a quasi–one dimensional disordered wire close to the universal Wigner–Dyson limit, provided λ is identified (via Thouless' argument) with the conductance. The third term in Eq. (3.26) represents the first nonperturbative correction to Wigner–Dyson statistics. It is intriguing to further explore this analogy.

Finally, we would like to mention that we have tested the quantitative applicability of Eq. (3.23) by means of extensive numerical simulations[36]. We found that the number variance $\Sigma^2(L)$ derived from formula (3.23) describes the data up to the largest spectral ranges of about $L \approx 140$ we investigated, as long as $\lambda \gg 1$. We have therefore confidence in the usefulness and correctness of Eq. (3.23).

IV. LOCAL LEVEL DENSITY

The local density describes the influence of an admixture on the m-th level, say, of a given spectrum. Consider the Hamiltonian $H(\alpha) = H^{(0)} + \alpha H^{(1)}$ defined in Eq. (2.4) with a diagonal regular part $H^{(0)}$. If we avoid averaging over $H^{(0)}$, we can study how the density around the m-th level of $H^{(0)}$ is affected as α (and hence the chaotic features) increase. This quantity was studied numerically in Refs. 18 and analytically in Refs. 38,39. However, this analytical derivation relies on the saddlepoint approximation and is therefore only valid for rather large values of α, i.e. when the level density is sufficiently smooth. It is the main purpose of this section to show that a direct and exact evaluation, valid for all values of α, of the local level density is easily possible by the methods outlined in Sec. II, even for finite level numbers. With this result we can study the local level density in the regime of small values α which is not accessible to the saddle point approximation. Apart from this, the calculation which follows is also of general interest for matrix models. In this context, we mention related work on Wigner random band matrices[40], which also focuses on the local density of states.

We express the local level density including its real part as the derivative

$$\widehat{R}_{1m}(x, \alpha) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{\partial Z_1(x, J, \alpha)}{\partial J_m}\bigg|_{J=0} \tag{4.1}$$

of the generating function

$$Z_1(x, J, \alpha) = \int d[\sigma]\, Q_1(\sigma, \alpha)\, \mathrm{detg}^{-1}\left((x^- - \sigma) \otimes 1_N - 1_2 \otimes H^{(0)} + \tau \otimes J\right) \tag{4.2}$$

depending on a source field $J = \mathrm{diag}(J_1, \ldots, J_N)$ which resolves the individual levels $n = 1, \ldots, N$. We introduced the matrix $\tau = \mathrm{diag}(-1, +1)$. As usual, we diagonalize the Hermitean supermatrix, $\sigma = u^{-1} s u$, where $s = \mathrm{diag}(s_1, i s_2)$. For the unitary supermatrix, we use the explicit parameterization

$$u = \begin{bmatrix} 1 + \beta\beta^*/2 & \beta \\ \beta^* & 1 + \beta^*\beta/2 \end{bmatrix} \tag{4.3}$$

in terms of the complex anticommuting angle β which allows us to cast the superdeterminant in Eq. (4.2) to first order in J into the form

$$\prod_{n=1}^{N} \frac{x - i s_2 - H^{(0)}_{nn}}{x - s_1 - H^{(0)}_{nn}} \sum_{n=1}^{N} J_n \left(\frac{1 + 2\beta\beta^*}{x - s_1 - H^{(0)}_{nn}} + \frac{1 + 2\beta^*\beta}{x - i s_2 - H^{(0)}_{nn}}\right) \ . \tag{4.4}$$

The derivative with respect to J_m can now be performed easily. To integrate over the eigenvalues and angles, we have to take the boundary contributions, often called Efetov Wegner terms, into account. As shown in Ref. 41, this can be done by applying Rothstein's theory[42] which yields the volume element

$$d[\sigma] = \frac{ds_1 ds_2}{(s_1 - is_2)^2} d\beta d\beta^* \left(1 - \beta^*\beta(s_1 - is_2)\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s_1} - i\frac{\partial}{\partial s_2}\right)\right) \tag{4.5}$$

in which the term containing the derivatives takes care of the boundary contributions. Collecting everything, we arrive after a straightforward calculation at the expression

$$\widehat{R}_{1m}(x,\alpha) = \frac{1}{\pi}\frac{1}{x^- - H^{(0)}_{mm}} + \frac{\partial}{\partial H^{(0)}_{mm}}\widehat{W}(x,\alpha) \tag{4.6}$$

for non-zero α. The first part, the Efetov Wegner term, is simply the unperturbed Green function of the m-th level. The second part can be written as the derivative of the function

$$\widehat{W}(x,\alpha) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\frac{ds_1 ds_2}{(s_1 - is_2)^2}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{\alpha^2}(s_1^2 + s_2^2)\right)\prod_{n=1}^{N}\frac{x - is_2 - H^{(0)}_{nn}}{x^- - s_1 - H^{(0)}_{nn}} . \tag{4.7}$$

Using the identity

$$\prod_{n=1}^{N}\frac{x - \nu_n}{x - \mu_n} = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{N}\frac{\nu_n - \mu_n}{\mu_n - x}\prod_{l\neq n}\frac{\nu_l - \mu_n}{\mu_l - \mu_n} \tag{4.8}$$

for $\mu_n = s_1 + H^{(0)}_{nn}$ and $\nu_n = is_2 + H^{(0)}_{nn}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{W}(x,\alpha) &= \frac{1}{2\pi^2}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\frac{ds_1 ds_2}{s_1 - is_2}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{\alpha^2}(s_1^2 + s_2^2)\right)\frac{b_n(s, H^{(0)})}{x^- - s_1 - H^{(0)}_{nn}} \\ b_n(s, H^{(0)}) &= \prod_{l\neq n}\left(1 + \frac{is_2 - s_1}{H^{(0)}_{ll} - H^{(0)}_{nn}}\right) .\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

This can be worked out further by introducing the permutation invariant symmetric functions $c_l(h), l = 0, \ldots, N-1$ of a set of variables $h_l,\ l = 1, \ldots, N-1$ which are defined through

$$\prod_{l=1}^{N-1}(1 + h_l z) = \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} c_l(h) z^l . \tag{4.10}$$

In particular we have

$$c_0(h) = 1, \quad c_1(h) = \sum_{l=1}^{N-1} h_l, \quad c_2(h) = \sum_{l<l'} h_l h_{l'}, \quad \ldots, \quad c_{N-1}(h) = \prod_{l=1}^{N-1} h_l . \tag{4.11}$$

Since $b_n(s, H^{(0)})$ has the structure of the generating function on the left hand side of Eq. (4.10) if we choose $h_l^{(n)} = 1/(H^{(0)}_{ll} - H^{(0)}_{nn})$ for $l \neq n$, we can express the first of Eqs. (4.9) in the form

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{W}(x,\alpha) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\sum_{l=0}^{N-1}(-1)^l c_l(h^{(n)}) \\ \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} ds_1 ds_2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\alpha^2}(s_1^2 + s_2^2)\right)\frac{(s_1 - is_2)^{l-1}}{x^- - s_1 - H^{(0)}_{nn}} .\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

The integral over s_2 yields precisely the Hermitean polynomials

$$H_{l-1}(z) = \frac{2^{l-1}}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\exp(-\zeta^2)(z - i\zeta)^{l-1} d\zeta \tag{4.13}$$

where, in particular, we have $H_{-1}(z) = -\sqrt{\pi}\exp(z^2)(1+\mathrm{erf}(z))$. The remaining s_1 integral can be viewed as the Stiltjes transform

$$\widehat{K}_{l-1}(z,\alpha) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{\exp(-s_1^2/\alpha^2)H_{l-1}(s_1/\alpha)}{z^- - s_1} ds_1 \ . \tag{4.14}$$

Hence, both integrals can be done and we arrive at

$$\widehat{W}(x,\alpha) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sum_{n=1}^{N}\sum_{l=0}^{N-1} \frac{(-1)^l\alpha^l}{2^l} c_l(h^{(n)})\widehat{K}_{l-1}(x-H_{nn}^{(0)},\alpha) \ . \tag{4.15}$$

We are mainly interested in the local level density, i.e. in the imaginary part $R_{1m}(x,\alpha) = \mathrm{Im}\,\widehat{R}_{1m}(x,\alpha)$, which is according to Eq. (4.6) given by

$$R_{1m}(x,\alpha) = \delta(x-H_{mm}^{(0)}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial H_{mm}^{(0)}} W(x,\alpha) \tag{4.16}$$

where $W(x,\alpha) = \mathrm{Im}\,\widehat{W}(x,\alpha)$. Since the imaginary part of the Stiltjes transform is here just an integration over a δ function, we find

$$W(x,\alpha) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sum_{n=1}^{N}\sum_{l=0}^{N-1} \frac{(-1)^l\alpha^l}{2^l}\, c_l(h^{(n)})\, \exp\left(-\frac{(x-H_{nn}^{(0)})^2}{\alpha^2}\right) H_{l-1}\left((x-H_{nn}^{(0)})/\alpha\right) \tag{4.17}$$

for an arbitrary matrix $H^{(0)}$. There is a subtle point here to be remarked. According to Eq. (4.12), the function $\widehat{W}(x,\alpha)$ is even in α. This, however, is not immediately obvious from Eq. (4.17). When we introduced the Hermitean polynomials (4.13), we used s_2/α as the new integration variable which eventually led to the term α^l in Eq. (4.17). To be mathematically cleaner, we should have used $s_2/|\alpha|$ which would have produced the term $|\alpha|^l$. Hence, we always assume $\alpha > 0$.

The form (4.17) of the function $W(x,\alpha)$ can be viewed as an expansion in the increasing complexity of the contributions due to the matrix $H^{(0)}$ which is reflected in the term $\alpha^l c_l(h^{(n)})$. To illustrate this, we consider the case of very small α in which only the $l=0$ term contributes significantly. Hence we find with Eq. (4.11)

$$\begin{aligned} W(x,\alpha) &\simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \exp\left(-\frac{(x-H_{nn}^{(0)})^2}{\alpha^2}\right) H_{-1}\left((x-H_{nn}^{(0)})/\alpha\right) \\ &= -\sum_{n=1}^{N}\left(1+\mathrm{erf}\left((x-H_{nn}^{(0)})/\alpha\right)\right) \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

which immediately implies

$$R_{1m}(x,\alpha) \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi\alpha^2}}\, \exp\left(-\frac{(x-H_{mm}^{(0)})^2}{\alpha^2}\right) \ . \tag{4.19}$$

Thus, for a very small admixture of $H^{(1)}$, the states of $H^{(0)}$ are smeared out with a Gaussian shape. This can only be true as long as these Gaussians do not overlap. As the admixture is increased with α, the Gaussian (4.19) of the m-th level slowly starts feeling the influence of the other levels of $H^{(0)}$ and higher and higher orders in l have to be taken into account. The complexity of this interaction is described through the more and more entangled structure of the symmetric functions $c_l(h^{(n)})$ as l increases. We mention in passing that, as is easily shown, the odd contributions in l can be neglected, provided, the m-th level lies in the middle of a very long spectrum. The shape of the local level density changes due to this coupling to the other levels of $H^{(0)}$. In Ref. 38,18, it was shown numerically that this shape is Lorentzian, even for relatively small admixture. This is no contradiction to the Gaussian shape (4.19) which only applies in the case of very small α. Pictorially speaking, the coupling to the other levels of $H^{(0)}$ lifts the tails of this Gaussian which then becomes a Lorentzian. In Ref. 39 this Lorentzian shape was analytically derived in the case of strong admixture.

A further insight into the expansions (4.15) and (4.17) is provided by the following consideration. Take a harmonic oscillator with mean level spacing $D^{(0)}$ as initial condition $H^{(0)}$, i.e. a picket fence spectrum with equidistant levels. The symmetric function $c_l(h^{(n)})$ scales now as $1/(D^{(0)})^l$ implying that the expansion parameter is now given by $\alpha/D^{(0)}$. This is a measure of the chaos producing interaction on the scale of the mean level spacing of the unperturbed spectrum. Qualitatively, this does also apply to arbitrary initial conditions $H^{(0)}$.

V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In this paper we have investigated spectral properties of a particular class of random Hamiltonians, namely the superposition of a diagonal matrix with Poisson statistics and a GUE. The motivation for this investigation came, apart from the obvious relevance for quantum chaology, from the fact that this class of matrices can serve as an ensemble of effective Hamiltonians for problems of current interest in both nuclear and condensed matter physics. After showing the equivalence of two alternative definitions of this random matrix ensemble, we analytically discussed two regimes, small values of the parameter λ, corresponding to small values of the electron–electron interaction U in the problem of coherent pair propagation[14], and the regime of large values of λ. In the limit $\lambda \gg 1$ we derived a novel explicit expression for the two point correlation function. In the crossover regime $\lambda \approx 1$ this expression and the already known perturbative result for small λ differ from each other and do no longer give a quantitatively correct picture. Comparison with the exact (albeit difficult to handle) expression (2.21) however reveals that the qualitative features of the crossover are still well described. This opens the possibility to study analytically and in detail statistical measures like the number variance Σ^2. Such a discussion, furnished with extensive numerical simulations, will be presented elsewhere[36].

In Ref. 8, the transition from regular to chaotic fluctuations was studied using a random matrix model in which the total level density undergoes a transition from a sharp Gaussian, in the regular case, to the Wigner semicircle. With the help of Fermi's Golden Rule, the critical length $L_{\max}$ was estimated as a function of the model parameters. The result in Ref 8 cannot be directly related to our discussion of the critical scale L_c. The chaoticity parameter Δ in Ref. 8 is defined on the original (and not the unfolded) energy scale, calling for a proper rescalings of the numerical and the analytical results. In Ref. 9 an additional time dependence was introduced to study energy dissipation. Depending on the value of the chaoticity parameter Δ a time scale t_1^* is identified. It distinguishes between a regime of anomalous diffusion proportional to t^2 for $t < t_1^*$ and normal diffusion for $t > t_1^*$ of the energy in the eigenbasis at $t = 0$. The precise relation of these interesting findings to the results presented here has yet to be investigated. It is quite plausible, however, that the different (chaotic and regular) regimes in the spectral statistics manifest themselves in this difference in the energy diffusion.

Finally we have shown how to calculate, for finite N, arbitrary values of α, and without approximation, the local density of states of the matrix ensemble. For extremely small values of α the shape of the local density of states turned out to be Gaussian. For larger α–values, when the levels on the diagonal of the matrix are no longer strictly isolated, a Lorentzian shape is expected[18,38,39].

We believe to have demonstrated in this paper that many statistical properties of the ensemble of random matrices studied here are well under control. This is particularly important in view of recent developments[18,8,9], where the ensemble considered in our work plays a central role.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We are grateful to S. Åberg, J.–L. Pichard, H.A. Weidenmüller and D. Weinmann for helpful discussions. We thank the referee for an important comment on our asymptotic expansion.

---

[1] H. Friedrich and D. Wintgen, Phys. Rep. **183**, 37 (1989).
[2] G.A. Leander, in *International Symposion on Weak and Electromagnetic Interaction in Nuclei*, ed. by H.V. Klapdor (Springer Verlag, Heidelberg, 1986) and references therein.
[3] T. Guhr and H.A. Weidenmüller, Ann. Phys. (NY) **193**, 472 (1989).
[4] M. Matsuo, T. Døssing, B. Herskind and S. Frauendorf, Nucl. Phys. A **564**, 345 (1993) and references therein.
[5] M.L. Mehta, *Random Matrices*, 2nd ed. (Academic Press, New York-London, 1991).
[6] F. Haake, *Quantum Signatures of Chaos* (Springer, Berlin, 1991).
[7] B. Lauritzen, T. Døssing and R. Broglia, Nucl. Phys. A **457**, 61 (1986).
[8] P. Persson and S. Åberg, Phys. Rev. E **52**, 148 (1995).
[9] S. Mizutori and S. Åberg, preprint Lund-MPh-95/15
[10] S. Iida, H.A. Weidenmüller, and J.A. Zuk, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **200**, 219 (1990); M.R. Zirnbauer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1584 (1992); A.D. Mirlin, A. Müller–Groeling, and M.R. Zirnbauer, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **236**, 325 (1994).

[11] A. Altland, S. Iida, A. Müller–Groeling, and H.A. Weidenmüller, Europhys. Lett. **20**, 155 (1992); Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **219**, 148 (1992).
[12] A. Schmid, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 80 (1991); B.L. Altshuler, Y. Gefen, and Y. Imry, *ibid.*, 88 (1991); F. v. Oppen and E.K. Riedel, *ibid.*, 84 (1991).
[13] L.P. Levy, G. Dolan, J. Dunsmuir, and H. Bouchiat, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2074 (1990); V. Chandrasekhar, R.A. Webb, M.J. Brady, M.B. Ketchen, W.J. Gallagher, and A. Kleinsasser, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 3578 (1991).
[14] D.L. Shepelyansky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 2607 (1994).
[15] Y. Imry, Europhys. Lett. **30**, 405 (1995).
[16] K. Frahm, A. Müller–Groeling, J.–L. Pichard, and D. Weinmann, Europhys. Lett. **31**, 169 (1995); D. Weinmann, A. Müller–Groeling, J.–L. Pichard, and K. Frahm, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1598 (1995).
[17] F. v. Oppen, T. Wettig, and J. Müller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 491 (1996).
[18] D. Weinmann and J.–L. Pichard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1556 (1996).
[19] Ph. Jacquod, D.L. Shepelyansky, and O.P. Sushkov, preprint (1996), cond–mat/9605141.
[20] T. Guhr, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 2258 (1996).
[21] T. Guhr, Ann. Phys. (NY), in press
[22] J.B. French, V.K.B. Kota, A. Pandey and S. Tomsovic, Ann. Phys. (NY) **181**, 198 (1988).
[23] F. Leyvraz and T.H. Seligman, J. Phys. **A23**, 1555 (1990); F. Leyvraz, J. Phys. **A26**, 6541 (1993).
[24] G. Lenz, Dissertation, Universität Essen, 1992.
[25] A. Pandey, Chaos, Solitons and Fractals, Vol. 5, No. 7, 1275 (1995)
[26] M. Moshe, A. Neuberger and B. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 1497 (1994).
[27] A. Altland and D. Fuchs, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4269 (1995).
[28] Harish-Chandra, Amer. J. Math. **80**, 241 (1958); C. Itzykson and J.B. Zuber, J. Math. Phys. **21**, 411 (1980).
[29] A. Pandey and M.L. Mehta, Commun. Math. Phys. **87** (1983), 449; M.L. Mehta and A. Pandey, J. Phys. **A16** (1983), 2655, L601.
[30] K.B. Efetov, Adv. Phys. **32**, 53 (1983).
[31] J.J.M. Verbaarschot, H.A. Weidenmüller and M.R. Zirnbauer, Phys. Rep. **129**, 367 (1985).
[32] T. Guhr, J. Math. Phys. **32**, 336 (1991).
[33] A. Pandey, Ann. Phys. (NY) **134**, 110 (1981).
[34] O. Bohigas and M.J. Gianonni, in *Chaotic Motion and Random Matrix Theory*, Lecture Notes in Physics Vol. 209 (Springer, Berlin, 1984), p. 1.
[35] Y.V. Fyodorov, private communication.
[36] T. Guhr and A. Müller–Groeling, in preparation.
[37] V.E. Kravtsov and A.D. Mirlin, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **60**, 656 (1994) [JETP Lett. **90**, 656 (1994)].
[38] P. Jacquod and D.L. Shepelyansky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3501 (1995).
[39] Y.V. Fyodorov and A.D. Mirlin, Phys. Rev. B **52**, R11580 (1995); K. Frahm and A. Müller–Groeling, Europhys. Lett. **32**, 385 (1995).
[40] Y.V. Fyodorov, O.A. Chubykalo, F.M. Izrailev and G. Casati, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 1603 (1996).
[41] T. Guhr, Nuc. Phys. **A560**, 223 (1993).
[42] M.J. Rothstein, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **299**, 387 (1987).